

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-15, 17-19, and 21-26 are pending. Claims 13-26 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-15, 17-19, and 21-26 remain in the case.

Applicant respectfully requests that the foregoing amendments be made prior to further examination of the present application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the reasons that follow. This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, along with appropriate defined status identifiers.

In response to applicant's prior response, the examiner has withdrawn a Section 112 rejection, but has maintained the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10 and 12 based on Aida *et al.* (EP 0 405 982) in view of Funayama *et al.* (5,128,286) and Nishihara *et al.* (US 6,433,089) with dictionary.com used for evidentiary value.

It is noted that examiner includes Aida, Funayama, Nishihara and dictionary.com in the rejection, but no longer discusses Nishihara or dictionary.com, and apparently has withdrawn that theory of the rejection following applicant's amendment of the main claim to change "absorb" to "adsorb." The examiner now relies solely upon Aida as teaching that crosslinking agent is adsorbed onto an inorganic filler, with Funayama being added as "teach[ing] a cross linking agent which has a main skeleton which comprises an N element containing cyclic compound, this is the borazine cross linking agent shown as compound (iii) (column 7 lines 5-18)".

It appears that the reference to Nishihara in the initial statement of the first Section 103(a) rejection was a mistake, as all of the later rejections refer to "Aida *et al.* (EP 0 405 982) in view of Funayama *et al.* (5,128,286) as applied to claim 1 above," and do not mention Nishihara *et al.* or dictionary.com. Furthermore, the examiner denotes the rejections in this case as being "new grounds of rejection" and combinations which included Nishihara and dictionary.com would not be new grounds of rejection. Therefore, applicant addresses the points raised by the examiner with respect to Aida and Funayama.

The crux of the examiner's rejection is found in paragraph 14 of the Action (emphasis added):

As stated above Aida *et al.* and Funayama *et al.* teach the molded articles of applicant's invention however they are silent regarding adsorbing the crosslinking agents onto an inorganic filler. However as all aspects of the invention are taught (*i.e.* the inorganic fillers and crosslinking agents) and as stated above Aida *et al.* teach that the inorganic filler undergoes a surface treatment with a crosslinking agent to increase dispersibility (page 5 lines 25-30) it must necessarily be so that some of, if not all of the crosslinking agent would be adsorbed onto the inorganic filler.

The agent used to increase dispersibility of the inorganic filler in Aida is a silane coupling agent, an organic titanate-based coupling agent, or a metallic salt of a fatty acid and NOT the crosslinking agent for the thermoplastic polymer.

These inorganic fillers may be used each alone or as mixtures. The kind and amount may be determined according to purposes. For the improvement of dispersibility, these fillers may be subjected to a surface treatment using, for example, a silane coupling agent, an organic titanate-based coupling agent, or a metallic salt of a fatty acid.

Claim 1 has been amended for emphasis, and now recites “a crosslinking agent for the thermoplastic polymer comprising at least one trifunctional crosslinking agent comprising a polyfunctional monomer or oligomer containing an unsaturated group in ends of the major skeleton.” There is no disclosure in Aida that the crosslinking agent for a thermoplastic polymer is previously adsorbed on an inorganic filler. Thus, it is not “necessarily so” that a crosslinking agent for the thermoplastic resin is adsorbed onto an inorganic filler. On this basis alone, no *prima facie* case of obviousness exists based on the combination of cited documents.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aida *et al.* (EP 405 982) in view of Funayama *et al.* (US 5,128,286) as applied to claim 1 above and in further view of Marzocchi (3,888,645). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aida *et al.* (EP 405 982) in view of Funayama *et al.* (US 5,128,286) as applied to claim 1 above and in further view Usuki *et al.* (US 4,889,885). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aida *et al.* (EP 405 982) in view of Funayama *et al.* (US 5,128,286) as applied to claim 1 above and in further view Tanaka *et al.* (JP 11-180990). None of the additional references cited in these rejections overcome the failure of Aida and Funayama to suggest that a crosslinking

agent for a thermoplastic polymer should be previously adsorbed on an inorganic filler in a resin molded article as presently claimed.

If there are any problems with this response, or if the examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application, Applicant's attorney would appreciate a telephone call. In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

OCTOBER 20, 2009

DATE

/BARBARA A. McDOWELL/

BARBARA A. McDOWELL

REG. NO. 31,640

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE, SUITE 150

ASHBURN, VA 20147

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)